Bell Atlantic 1300 I Street, N.W. Suite 400 West Washington, DC 20005

Gerald Asch
Director
Federal Regulatory
202 336-7844
Fax 202 336-**RECEIVED**

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED

Bell Atlantic

May 19, 1999

MAY 1 9 1999

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

OPPICE OF THE SECRETARY

Ms. Magalie R. Salas
Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
The Portals
445 12th Street S.W.
TW-A325 – 12th Street Lobby
Washington, D.C. 20554

Ex Parte

CC Docket 98-137- In the Matter of 1998 Biennial Review-Review of Depreciation
Requirements for Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers and ASD Docket No. 98-81, USTA
Petition for Forbearance from Depreciation Regulation

Dear Ms. Salas:

Re:

On May 19, 1999 Edward Googe, Thomas Whittaker and the undersigned representing Bell Atlantic met with the following members of the Common Carrier Bureau: Ms. Lisa Zaina, Mr. William Bailey, Ms. Fatina Franklin, Mr. Andy Mulitz and Mr. Tom David.

The discussion reflected the positions that Bell Atlantic had provided in their written comments and reply already on the record. A copy of the discussion guide used during the meeting is attached.

An original and a copy of this Ex Parte is being filed in the office of the Secretary on May 19, 1999. Please include it in the public record of the above referenced proceeding.

Respectfully submitted,

General asec.

Gerald Asch

Attachment

cc: Ms. Lisa Zaina w/o attachment
Mr. William Bailey "
Ms. Fatina Franklin "
Mr. Andy Mulitz "
Mr. Tom David "

No. of Copies rec'd O+3
Lis: #8006

DEPRECIATION FORBEARANCE

BELL ATLANTIC EX PARTE
5/19/99
CC Docket No. 98-137

ASD 98-81

FORBEARANCE IS REQUIRED NOW

■ INTRODUCTION:

- PURE PRICE CAPS
- SECTION 10(a) REQUIRES FORBEARANCE
- LECS HAVE ADDRESSED PARAGRAPH 6
- FORBEARANCE ≠ COMPLETE
 DEREGULATION
- GAAP PRINCIPLES
- FCC DEPRECIATION REGULATION IS NOT NEEDED BY STATE COMMISSIONS

PURE PRICE CAPS

- SHARING AND COMPETITION CONCERNS EXPRESSED IN 1993 NO LONGER RELEVANT
 - LECs Under Pure Price Caps
 - "Competition is not static, there will be no point at which competition arrives." (Commissioner Powell remarks before the Federal Communications Bar Association, 5/27/98)

PURE PRICE CAPS, CONT'D

■ DEPRECIATION HAS NO IMPACT ON DAY TO DAY RATE LEVELS

- Endogenous
- No Relation Between Accounting Earnings and Productivity (Statement of Professor Frank M. Gollop, Attachment B to USTA Comments)
- Per Depreciation Simplification, Commission should "reevaluate its decision" to retain depreciation regulation

FORBEARANCE REQUIRED BY SECTIONS 10(a) & 11

- DEPRECIATION REGULATION NO LONGER NECESSARY TO ENSURE REASONABLE RATES
- FORBEARANCE IS IN PUBLIC INTEREST
 - ELIMINATES REGULATORY COSTS
 - HELPS TO MAINTAIN INCENTIVE FOR LECS TO INVEST IN LOCAL NETWORKS
 - FULFILLS CONGRESS'S COMPETITIVE VISION "[ensures] there are economically rational options for those wanting to enter the market" (Remarks of Chairman Kennard to Legg Mason, 3/12/98)

PARAGRAPH 6 CONCERNS

LFAM

FCC retains authority to review LEC depreciation practices

ABOVE-CAP FILING

Stringent cost showing already required. [47 C.F.R., 61.49(e), 61.46 (c) and 61.47 (d)]

'X' FACTOR

Does not vary with changes in depreciation levels

UNIVERSAL SERVICE

GAAP is forward looking and thus consistent with Commission measure of universal service; GAAP would eliminate mismatch between ILECs and CLECs

CONCERNS, CONT'D

BFP

Per line revenue option is available; does not determine overall level of rate recovery

EXOGENOUS COSTS

Depreciation is endogenous; FCC has used revenues, rather than costs, to determine exogenous costs adjustments

UNE PRICES

FCC and some state commissions have endorsed use of economic depreciation; other states are free to set own depreciation

FORBEARANCE ≠ COMPLETE DEREGULATION

- FCC AUDIT AUTHORITY
- TARIFF REVIEW
- FORMAL COMPLAINT
- INDEPENDENT AUDITS
- "Rather than attempting to provide guaranteed outcomes for consumers, policymakers must, among other things...have courage to strengthen enforcement, rather than continuing to rely on prospective, prophylactic regulation" (Commissioner Powell remarks before the Federal Communications Bar Association, 5/27/98)

GAAP PRINCIPLES

■ MATCHING

■ CONSISTENCY IN REPORTING

■ CONSERVATISM

■ SAME DEPRECIATION RULES FOR ALL

STATE COMMISSIONS NO LONGER RELY ON FCC

ONLY TWO COMMISSIONS FILED COMMENTS

- FCC action should not affect authority of state regulators over intrastate operations (FPSC at 9)
- Forbearance would not interfere with state responsibilities (VSCC comments at 5)
- State Commissions Have Been Progressive
 - Many States Have Adopted GAAP (VSCC
 Comments at 3; BellSouth Comments at 6; GTE
 Comments at 14)

STATE REGULATORY STATUS

State	Some Lives Below FCC Ranges	I	Ability to Set Rates	Requires FCC Participation	Comments
Pennsylvania	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Required to filed Annual Report and Service Li Study triennially.
New Jersey	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No formal state requirements.
Delaware	No	Yes	Yes	No	No formal state requirements.
Virginia	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	ARP requires monitoring.
West Virginia	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No formal state requirements.
Maryland	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No formal state requirements.
Washington	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No formal state requirements.
New York	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	ARP sets depreciation floor.
Massachusetts	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	ARP allows for flexibility in setting new rates an requires lives to be no longer than FCC lives.
Maine	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	ARP allows for flexibility in setting new rates.
New Hampshire	Yes	No	No	No	Under rate of return regulation and continues to follow traditional depreciation practices.
Vermont	Yes	No	No	No _	Under rate of return regulation and continues to follow traditional depreciation practices.
Rhode Island	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	ARP allows flexibility and requires composite depreciation rate not below the 1/1/94 rate.
Connecticut	No	No	No	No	Under rate of return regulation and continues to follow traditional depreciation practices.

CONCLUSION

- FORBEARANCE
 - IS MANDATORY PURSUANT TO SECTIONS 10(a) & 11
 - WILL PROMOTE COMPETITION
 - WILL NOT HINDER OTHER FCC
 RESPONSIBILITIES
 - GAAP AND OTHER CONTROLS REMAIN IN PLACE